



ADDRESS

TO THE PEOPLE

Of the Counties of Columbiana, Stark,
and Wayne, in the State of Ohio.

THE late election of President of the United States, having produced considerable excitement in some parts of the Union, and knowing that the subject has been misrepresented by some, and presuming, that it is misunderstood by others, I have thought it might not be considered amiss in me, as one concerned in that election, to endeavor to undeceive the public, by submitting some views of what I conceive to be the true principles of the Constitution of the United States, in reference to the choice of a President, whenever that duty shall devolve on the House of Representatives, together with a statement of some facts not generally known; as, also, a candid avowal of the motives, by which my conduct was governed on that occasion.

I am aware that in general, it may be considered a fruitless effort, to oppose calm and dispassionate reason and argument, to declamation and crimination; but having good reason to hope, that the number of those, who indulge in the latter mode of discussion are few, when compared with those whose judgments are called upon to decide in the case, I feel a confidence that a generous public will, in examining the views which I here present, discard from their minds, as far as possible, every consideration which may tend to prevent a fair decision. There has, perhaps, been no subject, since the formation of the present government, concerning which, in the same period of time, there has been so much written and published; but there is one thing peculiar in reference to it; and that is, that so far as has come within my observation, there has not been published in any part of the country, a single article in the shape of argument, or constitutional exposition, by those who object to the choice made by the House of Representatives. I call the attention of the public to this fact, for the purpose of shewing, that in the course of more than a year, those who say, that a clear and palpable violation of the constitution, and a

total disregard of republican principles has taken place, have not in all that time, been able to offer one solitary fact, or argument, in support of the assertion; but have been compelled to resort to epithet and abuse; charging fraud and corruption upon men, the acts of whose lives have placed them above even a suspicion of that kind. How far those, who make such charges, will be able to sustain themselves with the public, in the absence of all reasoning and evidence, time must determine. In the discussion of this question, I propose to shew that the choice made, was in perfect accordance with the principles of the constitution, and in strict conformity with the genius of republican government; and, therefore, in every point of view, right and proper, both in regard to principle and expediency. And that so far as time has been afforded to test the measures of the administration, they are such as every real friend of his country may well be proud of.

In the formation of the constitution of the United States, in reference to the election of President and Vice President, the situation was peculiarly difficult. They were the only officers, in the appointment of whom, the whole people of the Union were to participate; the appointment of all others was confided to the people of the States respectively.—Representatives in congress were to be elected by the people of each state, and Senators by the state legislatures. It was, therefore, more difficult to arrange and settle the mode of appointing these officers, than any thing which concerned the individual states. Great jealousy at that period prevailed among the states, and fears were entertained (and perhaps justly) that a few states might monopolize the power of the whole, unless the plan of the new government was laid with the greatest circumspection. Hence the provision, that in the election of President and Vice President, a majority should, in every mode of election prescribed, be necessary to a choice. Were this not the case, it might happen that in consequence of the great number of candidates, a person who could succeed in getting the vote of one or two states, might gain the election; although he might not be the choice of one-fourth part of the people of the Union.—The evils attendant on such a state of things it is not necessary to describe; they will readily suggest themselves to every reflecting mind. Having established the principle that a majority was necessary to a choice, it was discovered, that, frequently no choice would be made by the people, and that it was necessary to provide some mode for settling the

question in case of that event happening ; and the House of Representatives was selected, as the tribunal to decide, in case of the non election of a President, and the Senate in the case of Vice President. But though called on to choose, those officers, in case the people fail to elect, these bodies are very differently situated from that of the colleges of electors in the respective states. Electors are chosen for the express purpose of electing a President and Vice President ; the Representatives and Senators are chosen before the Presidential election, and generally without regard to that election. The House of Representatives being a pre-existent body, not chosen in reference to the primary election, when the choice of a President devolves on them, they can with propriety be viewed in no other light, than that of impartial umpires or arbitrators, appointed by the constitution, to settle the controversy between the states, concerning which of the candidates for whom they had voted, should be the President : and the direction of the constitution, that, "they shall choose from the persons having the highest numbers, not exceeding three on the list," is conclusive that the House of Representatives are authorised to exercise a sound discretion, and to choose that one of the three, which, in their judgments, is the best qualified to discharge the high and important duties of the station : and that no mistake of the members in making the selection, can be charged, as a violation of the principles of the constitution, as I hope to shew in the sequel.

Suppose any of you were appointed arbitrators to settle a controversy between three of your neighbors, who were contending for the title of a tract of land ; the whole subject was referred to you, and you had bound yourselves by a solemn oath, to render your award in favor of him who presented the fairest claim to the property—each of the claimants had chosen an equal number of referees—all were equally represented : let me ask how you would decide in such a case ? would you be governed by a determined adherence, right or wrong, to the interest of the party whose choice you were ? or would you decide in favor of the party who had established the fairest claim to the property in question ? I feel confident that in such a case no fair-minded, honorable man, could for a moment hesitate in saying, that by all the principles of morality, imposed by the sacred obligations of an oath, the circumstance of the wishes or interest of the party choosing you, ought to have no influence ; but that it ought to be decided according to justice and

equity. The case of the late Presidential election was similar, in all respects, to the arbitration mentioned. Three persons were presented to the House of Representatives, by the people, who had tried to make a choice, but failed. By the constitution, and the oath they had taken, the members were bound, absolutely bound, to make a choice. They were not in the situation of electors, called on to vote as the people had voted, because, if they had, no choice ever could have been made, and the office must have remained vacant ; and thus, the only object of the constitution, in referring it to the House, would have been defeated. The constitution requires that the members representing a majority of the states, shall be necessary to agree in a choice : if the members vote as the people have voted, nothing is more clear than that no choice can take place ; it therefore never could have been the intention of the constitution, that the members should be bound by any thing but their own judgments, and the interest of the country at large ; any other construction would render the whole provision nugatory, and absurd. To require the members to make a choice, and at the same time expect them to be governed by a rule, which in the nature of things, rendered it absolutely impossible that they ever could come to a decision ; is what no sensible, dispassionate, reflecting man will contend for, as being either the provisions of the constitution or the intention of its framers. From this view of the question it appears clear that the constitution, in requiring the House of Representatives to choose the President, intended, that in the performance of that duty, they should be governed by a conscientious regard to the comparative fitness of the persons out of whom the choice was to be made, and decide accordingly. But it is contended by some, that at the first ballot, and whilst there is any prospect of success, the members ought to vote for the person for whom a majority of their immediate constituents had voted at the Presidential election. This doctrine must have been adopted without sufficient examination ; it can scarcely be possible that any man who regards moral honesty, would wish the Presidential election in congress to be managed by rules similar to those which govern the veriest horse-jockies in the land, who, in the exercise of their vocation, continue to ask *boot*, until all hopes of a trade on that condition is at an end ; and then agree to exchange even. The countenance of such a principle as that, could not fail to degrade and contaminate congress ; and in time render it unworthy of all confidence. This doctrine lays

down a principle which makes crime indispensable to the carrying into operation a provision of the constitution ; it requires it as a duty of all to vote as their immediate constituents had voted, and then enjoins a scuffle about who shall first violate that duty. If the principle be correct that the vote of those who attend the Presidential election is to be obligatory, it can make no difference in either a moral, or political point of view, who it is that first gives way and votes different from the vote of his district, or from his first vote ; if it be wrong in principle, it cannot be right from necessity ; and whether that member be from Ohio, or Pennsylvania, or any other state, it can make no difference. The state which holds out longest, and succeeds in outwitting the others, like the successful jockey, who clings fast to the boot, may exult ; but congress, as a body, would, in the eyes of all honorable men, be considered degraded by the establishment of such a principle. But it is further contended, that, although the constitution confers the power to choose either of the three highest on the list of candidates, yet, that a due regard to republicanism, and the rights of the people, requires that the person having the highest number of electoral votes throughout the Union, ought to be chosen. This is a position much more entitled to consideration than those I have already discussed ; and where the electoral votes were clearly expressive of the wishes of the majority of the people of the states, in which they were given, and there was no disparity in the merits and qualifications of the candidates ; will, no doubt, always have a decisive influence. Let this doctrine, in connexion with the facts which existed in the case of the last Presidential election, be now examined. In discussing this part of the subject, on democratic principles, it is not presumed that any thing can be claimed, for the vote of an elector, beyond what belongs to it as being in accordance with the will of the people of the state, for which he is appointed ; there certainly cannot be any superior sanctity in the character of an elector, which would deny to the House of Representatives, when they are called on to vote upon the same question, the right of examining and ascertaining whether the votes of the electors, in each state, were in conformity with the votes of the people therein. If this right were to be denied, whilst it would bind the House of Representatives to the will of the electors instead of the people, it would place the electors at perfect liberty to disregard the express commands of those by whom they were appointed, and destroy

all their responsibility to the people. In pursuing this subject, let us suppose, that a part or all of the electors of one or more states, were to vote for a person different from the one for whom the people when electing them intended they should vote; or, by any other means, the expression of the wishes of the people of the state, as made at the electoral election, was not sustained by the electoral vote of such state; and suppose these facts to have been known to the House of Representatives at the time of choosing the President, must they shut their eyes to these facts, be governed by the vote of the electors, and disregard the vote of the people, and thus aid in disappointing their wishes? It is hoped that no man claiming to be a republican, will contend for such a principle as this. The case here stated, is in all respects, similar to that of a claim to a tract of land founded on a deed of conveyance; the instrument, on its face, appears fair, and conformable to the law; it appears to have been duly executed and properly authenticated; but on enquiry in court, the fact is made out, that the maker of the deed had himself no title to the property; would any honest man in that case contend that the court ought to decide in favor of the holder of such a deed, and deprive the rightful owner of his property? certainly not: such an act would be subversive of all justice. Yet such a case would be exactly of a piece with that of the vote of electors given for a person different from the vote of the people of the state, which alone can constitute their authority for their vote. From the reasons which have been suggested, it must appear evident that the House of Representatives does possess, by the constitution, and the reason of the case, a discretionary and supervising power over the subject; so far at least, as to enquire whether the votes of the electors, have been in conformity with the public will, as expressed by the people of the respective states at the time of the electoral election; and if any difference be found, the people ought certainly to be entitled to the greatest deference. If any thing is binding on the House, it is certainly their will, in preference to that of the electors. It follows now to shew, that at the last Presidential election, the votes of the electors of some of the states did not represent the will of the people of those states; and that in the choice which the House of Representatives made, they did conform to the wishes of the greatest number of the votes of the people of the respective states as expressed at the election of electors; and that they did make choice of that person, who, if the votes of the whole

body of the people voting in each state, had decided the choice of electors, would have received, at least, four votes more than any other candidate; and on the principle contended for, ought to have been chosen. In determining this fact, it will only be necessary to turn our attention to three states; in all the others the election was decisive, and left no doubt concerning who was the choice of the people of each; and in all but these three states, the votes of the electors were agreeably to the votes of the people. In the state of New York the electors were appointed by the legislature, and were intended to vote partly for Mr. Adams, partly for Mr. Clay, and partly for Mr. Crawford; yet one of the electors of that state abused the trust reposed in him and voted for Gen. Jackson. In Maryland and Illinois, the electors were chosen by the people, but by reason of those states being divided into districts, the majority of the people of the state did not determine the choice of electors. In Maryland Mr. Adams had three electoral votes, Mr. Crawford one, and Gen. Jackson seven. In Illinois Mr. Adams had one electoral vote, and Gen. Jackson two; notwithstanding, at the election for electors, Mr. Adams had, in Maryland, upwards of 200, and in Illinois nearly 300 more of the people's votes, than were given for Gen. Jackson. Can it then, with the least shadow of truth or propriety, be said, that Gen. Jackson was the choice of the people of either Maryland or Illinois? No person who regards his reputation for veracity or common sense, will hazard the assertion. These facts are conclusive; they were known to congress at the time of making the choice, and no one who does not expect to sustain himself by sophistry and evasion, can escape conceding the fact, that in giving effect to the expressed will of the people of these states, congress conformed to the democratic republican principle. Going then on that principle, we must deduct one electoral vote given in New York, seven given in Maryland, and two given in Illinois, in all 10 votes, from the poll of Gen. Jackson; this will reduce it from 99 to 89 votes. And for the same reasons we must add 7 votes in Maryland, and 2 in Illinois to Mr. Adams's poll, in all 9 votes; which will increase it from 84 to 93 votes, being 4 more votes than can on any fair principle be allowed to Gen. Jackson. The vote in New York which was given improperly for Gen. Jackson, is not added to Mr. Adams's poll, because it might have been intended for Mr. Clay or Mr. Crawford, of which I am not advised. It is not my intention in enforcing my views on

this subject, to censure any one for the opinion he may entertain; but I must be permitted to say, that, in their zeal to condemn the conduct of those members of congress who voted for Mr. Adams, the supporters of Gen. Jackson have ran into a number of inconsistencies and extravagancies. I have long witnessed how easy it is for honest, unsuspecting men, to be deceived in questions of great moment by the artifice of the cunning and ambitious, who, in all ages and countries, pretend to hold in great veneration the public will, until they once get elevated into power. Most men entertain a commendable jealousy in regard to their political rights; and it is only when that jealousy is too much excited, and inflamed by the clamours of the demagogue, and dishonest politician, against the honest and faithful statesman, that it operates as a public misfortune. Of the many charges that are brought against those who considered it their duty to vote for Mr. Adams in preference to Gen. Jackson, and the ground on which they are attempted to be supported, I will examine but a few:—In the first place, it is contended, that the vote given by the people of his district, at the Presidential election, ought most decidedly to govern the member of congress in giving his vote in the House of Representatives. In the second place, that the vote of the whole people of the state should be the rule of his conduct: and, last of all, that he is unquestionably bound to vote for that candidate who may have received the greatest number of electoral votes throughout the Union. Now, in order to test the soundness and consistency of these rules of conduct, prescribed for the government of the Representative, let us examine how they will operate; and if it shall be discovered, that in practice, they will be certain to run counter to each other, they cannot be correct. If a set of rules be laid down for the government of our conduct, each one of which impels us in a different direction, no doubt can remain of their being wrong in principle; no rules can be right, which require a man to do three opposite acts in relation to the same object at the same time. It will often happen that the vote of the people of the district will not be the same with that of the state; and the vote of the Union will, as frequently, be different from both. The vote of the district may be for A. that of the state for B. and that of the Union for C. In such an event, how are these rules, which are presented with so much certainty and confidence in their correctness, to be reconciled; so as to give effect to each, and preserve all from being violated. Could any thing be more conclusive of the

fallacy of this doctrine of obligation to the supposed will of the people, than the dilemma in which a person finds himself placed, by following it to its consequences? The fact is, that the vote of a district or state, is conclusive of one thing only; and that is, as to who shall be chosen electors; and never could have been intended as a rule of conduct for the Representative. The time has been when this congressional district did not give perhaps more than 200 votes for electors; would it then have been contended that the vote of these 200 persons should bind the Representative in a district containing upwards of 10 000 freemen? It is presumed that none will be found extravagant enough to contend for carrying the principle thus far. At the last Presidential election the candidates in favor of Gen. Jackson obtained in this district about 14,00 votes, and those in favor of other candidates about 1,100; and it is contended that the former are alone entitled to consideration; that all other evidence of public opinion ought to be rejected: in short, that upwards of 10,000 freemen, who voted for other candidates, or, who knowing that the election must be decided in congress, and confiding in their Representative, did not attend the election, ought to be put entirely out of the question: that they, in regard to every thing subsequently connected with the choice of President, ought to be disfranchised: that their opinions should have no attention paid to them by their Representative: that they have no right to advise with him as to who ought to be chosen, but that if they did, he should, in substance, say to them—"Sirs, you did not attend the election of electors; you have forfeited your claim by that omission; you have no right to advise with me on this subject; the right to counsel me in this matter belongs, exclusively, to the majority of those who attended that election; them, and them only, I must obey, though the country be ruined by the act."

This is a fair illustration of the doctrine. Is it not too palpably erroneous, to meet the approbation of any man, who will examine it with candor. Then away with this clamor about violating and disregarding the will of constituents. Who are the constituents? those who attend a particular election? or the great body of the citizens, whether they attend an election or not? unquestionably the whole: it is the interests of the whole body that are confided to the Representative, and he is as much bound to respect the opinions of the one class, as those of the other.

In making the choice of President, which it was my duty

to do as a member of the House of Representatives, between Mr. Adams, Mr. Crawford and gen. Jackson, I felt myself at perfect liberty, so far as personal considerations could have any influence. I had been opposed to the election of each, and all of them; and, in my capacity of private citizen, I had used all fair means in my power to prevent either from being elected. The man of my choice was defeated; he was not returned to the House; he was out of the question. This left me free to act, uninfluenced by predilections or aversions. The question I had now to ask myself was, which of these men would be most likely to administer the government, in conformity with the principles of the constitution, and the interests of the people of the country at large. The answer to this question governed my conduct. The state of Mr. Crawford's health was such, as to put the contest in my mind, at once between gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams. General Jackson had by his services, added much to the military reputation of the country; but so much of his character has been developed that I could not but see in it a trait, too common to distinguished military men, in all ages and countries, a disposition to condemn the salutary agency of the law, and to rely on the application of force, for effecting all important objects. Besides, his friends, in blazoning forth his deeds, seemed to rely for success on arousing the military spirit of the country, and causing it to predominate a state of feeling in the absence of war, always dangerous to a republic. I could not bring myself to believe, that it would be subserving the cause of democracy, to raise to the presidency, a man, be his intentions ever so pure, who had by a military force, dissolved the legislature of a sovereign State, and suspended the operation of all its laws. All history furnishes us with but two instances, of men who dared to perform such an act. These men were Cromwell and Bonaparte, and both of them afterwards usurped every power of the government, and, virtually, became absolute monarchs. It may be well here to remark, that they, too, stood foremost in early life, as the boasted champions of the interests and liberties of their respective countries, and denounced all who did not contribute to forwarding of their views, as conspirators against the rights of the people: and the exclamation, "huzza for Cromwell," or "huzza for Bonaparte," was in their day equally potent, and sure to be resorted to in place of argument, as is now, in some parts of our country, the cry of "huzza for Jackson."

The office of president of the U. States, I considered was not intended by the constitution as a reward for military or other services; in this country every officer receives compensation for his services in money; that done, all claims on that score cease. The office was created for the purpose of administering the government for the benefit of the nation; and, in filling it, those qualifications, which fit a man for the performance of the duty, ought alone to be sought for. It is not what a man has done, but what he is capable of doing, and probably will do, that ought to be taken into consideration. A man may be very brave, and may have fearlessly led a platoon to a cannon's mouth, who knows but little of the affairs of civil government; or he may be possessed of a turbulent and violent spirit, which is constantly leading him into personal contests with all with whom he is called to act. I could refer to many instances of this kind in the life of gen. Jackson, which I then considered as affording evidence of his unfitness for the office of Chief Magistrate of this union of republics. But I forbear. My love for the supremacy of the law, (the only safeguard of liberty,) and my aversion to the use of all force against law, under any pretext whatever, together with a firm conviction in my mind, that he was not the choice of a majority of the American people, precluded me from voting for him. In addition to this, I had still another objection, and that was on account of his having in his support most of the adventurous, aspiring and ambitious men of the country; whose counsel it was fair to presume, would have much influence in determining the conduct he would pursue, if placed at the head of the government. To Mr. Adams I had also several objections, but they were not of the same character with those I entertained against gen. Jackson. His errors appeared to be rather of a theoretic, than practical kind.—He had never, that I knew of, shewn any disregard of the constitution, or laws of the country, or sought to substitute force for law; his pursuits through life had given his mind a different direction and inclination: in a long course of public employment, he had given evidence of a thorough knowledge of the laws of nations; and an intimate acquaintance with the affairs of our own government. I had conceived objections to him on account of his supposed opposition to domestic manufactures and internal improvements; but became satisfied, that whatever might have been the fact, in relation to his views upon these subjects at any former period, he did not then entertain opinions hostile to

their interests. I had, also, objections to some of his early political notions ; but as they were principally of a speculative kind, I considered them much less dangerous, than those avowed by his opponents ; and especially when I reflected that the latter had accompanied the avowal, with the expression of a settled purpose, to enforce them, if ever clothed with authority. It has always been Mr. Adams's practice to appeal to the judgments and not to the fears of men.—Rashness, in the use of power, had never been considered as forming any part of his character ; he was known to be deliberate and cautious in the adoption of measures. The men of his counsel were civilians, and not warriors ; men not under the dominion of their passions ; but of sober, reflecting minds, well tempered by experience. Such, to my mind, was the contrast of character between gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams, and their prominent supporters at the time of the election. Those who inclined to be governed by former party distinctions, in deciding the question, and who had objected to Mr. Adams, on account of his having once belonged to the federal party ; had nothing to promise themselves on that score from the election of gen. Jackson ; as there were among his supporters, some of the most conspicuous federalists of the Union ; besides, in letters written by him to Mr. Monroe, he had expressed a wish that the "*monster* party spirit might be exterminated;" and as a means of effecting that object, had advised him to conduct his administration without regard to party. What he had recommended Mr. Monroe to do, it was fair to presume he would do himself.

Entertaining these opinions of the rival candidates, I was called upon to give my vote : I felt, I trust, to its full extent, the importance of the situation I occupied and the responsibility I incurred in making a choice. I had no interest but my country's to serve—to that country I owed much ; by its favor I had been placed in its councils, and promoted to the society of the most conspicuous of its statesman ; its institutions were dear to me, and it was the wish of my heart, that they might remain unimpaired, and be perpetuated. I knew, that in doing my duty, I should render myself obnoxious to the displeasure and phrenzy of heated partisans ; but I confided in the sober judgment of a generous people ; but above all, in the convictions of my own conscience, that I was doing the best that could be done under the circumstances. The act is past : the principles upon which it rests, and the motives which dictated

it, have been explained : let us now enquire what evidence time and experience have afforded of its correctness. More than a year has elapsed since Mr. Adams entered upon the administration of the government ; more than one-fourth part of a term of service has expired. Let us ask what he has done in that term to fulfil the predictions of those who saw nothing but the prostration of Republican government in his election. Let us compare the conduct of the administration with that of the opposition, and see which has evinced the greatest devotion to the interest of the country, and the cause of democracy. The message of Mr. Adams to congress, at the commencement of the last session, which it is presumed most of you have read, contains a full exposition of his policy. It may be classed under three heads—domestic manufactures, internal improvements, and the extension of our commerce, so as to find a market for our surplus produce. Intimately connected with the last branch is the recommendation to send ministers to the Congress at Panama. This Congress is to consist of ministers from all the southern republics. The reasons for this measure are at large set forth in a separate message, which has been widely circulated, and to which I refer you. All the affairs of our country, over which the government has any influence whatever, are prosperous beyond example. The exports of the country, during the last year, exceed, by several millions of dollars, the imports of the same period ; thus turning the balance of trade in our favor which was heretofore against us ; by these means we will be enabled to retain the money in the country, which had formerly to be sent abroad. Domestic manufactures have succeeded, even beyond the expectations of their most ardent friends. Internal improvements, under the patronage of the general government, have commenced in several sections of the Union ;—and will be extended as fast as the resources of the nation will authorise. In this state of things what has been, and is now, the conduct of the opposition ? Have they not generally been engaged in endeavors to discourage domestic manufactures and internal improvements ? In all the states south of Maryland, which contain the great body of general Jackson's supporters, there is not one in twenty, but are decidedly hostile to both these measures of policy ; as will be seen by a reference to the journals of Congress. And what has been their conduct after so many professions of regard for republican principles ? Have their acts sustained their declarations ? Where is the evidence of their veneration for

the rights of man, if their declarations be excluded? Who is it among us, who is a republican in heart, that does not feel an intense interest for the success of free government; that would not desire that our government, should do every thing in its power, consistent with the support of our neutrality, to foster and encourage it? Yet we find those vociferous pretended republicans, almost to a man, denouncing the republics of South America; and opposing violently our doing any thing either to encourage them or attach them to our interests; although such is the importance of our growing commerce with them, that, even now, it is more extensive than with any nation on the globe, G. Britain and France excepted. So that, whether we view the conduct of the opposition on this subject, as resulting from hostility to republican government in South America, or a disregard to the commercial and manufacturing interests, which have much at stake in the trade with that country, it is equally reprehensible. Much complaint has been made about the abuse of patronage, by Mr. Adams, in the appointment of members of Congress to office; but when it is known that only four have been appointed, and that only one of these voted for Mr. Adams, it will be seen that this, like all the other charges, is without foundation; though it is reiterated, with as much apparent confidence, as if every member of congress had received an office. But I will not dwell on unfounded falsehoods, which were made without reason and reported without proof.

As it respects myself, a residence of upwards of twenty years in the district which has so often honored me with its confidence, has I trust, enabled the public to know me too well to give credit to any ungenerous aspersions on my character. Let the history of my congressional services be reviewed, and see if every part of it does not exhibit a most ardent devotion to the interests of my constituents? Let it be asked whether they have not derived benefit since I have served them, beyond that of any other period; and even greater than they had ever expected? And are these things to be considered of no consequence, because gen. Jackson did not get a sufficient number of the peoples votes, to give him a fair claim to be chosen president? Are the benefits resulting from the joint efforts of the Ohio delegation in congress, to be accounted as nothing in comparison with the election of gen. Jackson? When pecuniary embarrassments, a few years ago, pervaded the land, and spread a gloom over every countenance; and when it was thought that nothing

could save this part of the country from ruin, but the election of representatives to congress, who fully understood your interest, and who were competent to advocate it,—would the election of gen. Jackson at that time have satisfied the public wants, and quieted the public fears? Would it have prevented your lands from forfeiture, and extended the time and moderated the terms of payment? or would domestic manufactures and internal improvements, have received the fostering attention of the government? No, fellow-citizens, such a proposition would then have been derided by you; it would have been scouted as the ravings of a disordered brain. No such things could have been expected from his election: the great body of his supporters in other states, are the men with whom the Ohio delegation have had to contend, when endeavoring to advance your interests; and they are the men whose opinions and advice must influence gen. Jackson, if ever he succeeds to the presidential chair. This is in the nature of things inevitable: every man is in a great degree influenced by the opinions and wishes of his intimate friends and warmest supporters. It is extremely unpleasant to be compelled to speak of one's own services; and nothing but the bitter persecution which I have been forced to endure for several years past, could have induced me to lay aside, in any degree that delicacy which has ever regulated my course in such matters.

All I ask for myself is, that a careful examination be made of my private character and of my public acts; let them be compared with the character and conduct of the men who are foremost in assailing the integrity of my conduct, and charging me with corruptly disregarding the public will. Enquire who they are, and what they have done to merit public confidence? Ask in what is their disinterested acts to be discovered; and what claim have they to be believed against me without evidence? Should the situation of public affairs require individual sacrifices, are they the men upon whom the public may safely rely as benefactors? What act of their lives can they point to, and say with truth, "in that the public was benefitted?" Are they not for the most part "the men of yesterday?" ambitious of power, but inimical to merit? Men who expect to effect more by decrying the character of others, than by seeking to maintain a good reputation themselves? Should the persecuting and calumniating course, which has for a long time been pursued against me, be sanctioned by the public, then, indeed will the time have arrived, when it may with truth be

said, "the post of honor is a private station." But I have too much confidence in the discernment and justice of my fellow-citizens, to believe that they will yield to such impositions. No, they will not. They are too much attached to the cause of truth, and too much interested in the maintenance of honest, well merited reputation, to suffer it thus to fall a prey.

Your obedient servant,

J. SLOANE.

WOOSTER, August 1st, 1826.



Extract of a letter from His Excellency JOSEPH KENT, Governor of the State of Maryland, to J. Sloane.

"From the official returns, I find that Gen. Jackson received 14,449 votes, and Mr. Adams 14,695 votes, and Mr. Crawford 3,346 votes.

"The election of Mr. Adams is well received in Maryland, and must be every where, with every reflecting man, who either understands or regards the true interests of the country."

"Statement of the whole number of votes given for electors in Illinois at the last election of President and Vice President.

For Mr. Adams, 1,542 | For Gen. Jackson, 1,272

" Mr. Clay, 1,047 | " Mr. Crawford, 219

"The foregoing contains a statement of votes given in Illinois.

(Signed)

D. P. COOK."

Statement of Electoral Votes for President.

	J. Q. ADAMS,	W. H. CRAWFORD,	A. JACKSON,	H. CLAY,		J. Q. ADAMS,	W. H. CRAWFORD,	A. JACKSON,	H. CLAY,
Maine	9	00	00	00	North Carolina	00	00	15	00
New Hampshire	8	00	00	00	South Carolina	00	00	11	00
Massachusetts	15	00	00	00	Georgia	00	9	00	00
Rhode Island	4	00	00	00	Kentucky	00	00	00	14
Connecticut	8	00	00	00	Tennessee	00	00	11	00
Vermont	7	00	00	00	Ohio	00	00	00	16
New York	26	5	1	4	Louisiana	2	00	3	00
New Jersey	00	00	8	00	Mississippi	00	00	3	00
Pennsylvania	00	00	28	00	Indiana	00	00	5	00
Delaware	1	2	00	00	Illinois	1	00	2	00
Maryland	3	1	7	00	Alabama	00	00	5	00
Virginia	00	24	00	00	Missouri	00	00	00	3
					Total,	84	41	99	37

